

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-7 and 9-26 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 20 are amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 8 and claim 8 is canceled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter recited therein. In addition, claims 9 and 10 are amended to depend from claim 1. No new matter is added. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested, at least in light of the following remarks.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 because the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration (as the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution; and (c) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

**I. Claim for Priority**

A PCT application was filed on September 19, 2005 with a certified copy of the priority documents for this application. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner acknowledge receipt of the certified copies.

**II. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-8, 13, 14 and 17-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,157,809 to Kambayashi in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0045277 to Mittal; rejects claims 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kambayashi, Mittal and U.S. Patent No. 6,005,565 to Legall et al. (Legall); and rejects claims 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kambayashi, Mittal and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0147814 to Kimchi et al. (Kimchi). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Kambayashi and Mittal, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose each and every feature recited in claim 1. For example, claim 1 is amended to recite "during the step of generating the subsequent information request, the initial request is extended by specifying a time interval" and "during the step of receiving description data, the data supplied relates to audiovisual content broadcast in the time interval specified in the subsequent information request," which are incorporated from original claim 8.

In the rejection of original claim 8, the Office Action asserts that the combination of Kambayashi and Mittal disclose the above feature because Kambayashi allegedly discloses the recited feature. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion. For example, Kambayashi discloses a video image reproduced and displayed on a display unit and constructed of a main picture corresponding to a main program in a sub-picture corresponding to a menu related to the main program (see Kambayashi, col. 11, lines 47-53). A video signal of the sub-picture can be added to that of the main picture in a broadcasting station, the video signal of the sub-picture signal being multiplexed with part of a vertical blanking period, which is a time interval in the main video signal (see Kambayashi, col. 11, lines 54-61).

However, Kambayashi fails to disclose that the vertical blanking interval is specified in the request or that the vertical blanking interval defines a time period for content being broadcasted, as required by claim 1. The only time interval disclosed in Kambayashi is the vertical blanking interval. Accordingly, Kambayashi fails to disclose extending a request by specifying a time interval and receiving description data related to audiovisual content being broadcasted in the time interval specified in the request. Mittal also fails to disclose these recited features. Thus, even if Mittal were combined with Kambayashi, the deficiency of Kambayashi would not be remedied. Also, Legall and Kimchi do not cure the deficiencies of Kambayashi and Mittal. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over the cited references.

Claims 2-7, 9-19 and 23-26 depend from independent claim 1. Therefore, these claims are also patentable at least for their dependency on independent claim 1, as well as for the additional features they recite.

Independent claim 20 recites features similar to independent claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 20 is also patentable at least for the reasons discussed above for claim 1, as well as for the additional features claim 20 recites. Dependent claims 21 and 22 depend from independent claim 20. Therefore, these claims are also patentable at least for their dependence on claim 20, as well as for the additional features these claims recite.

Applicant thus respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections.

**III. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



William P. Berridge  
Registration No. 30,024

Brian K. Kauffman  
Registration No. 63,199

WPB:BKK/mab

Attachment:  
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: February 17, 2009

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--